DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 355 659 EA 024 777

AUTHOR Milstein, Mike M.

TITLE The Danforth Program for the Preparation of School Principals (DPPSP) Six Years Later: What We Have Learned.

PUB DATE Oct 92

NOTE 44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (Minneapolis, MN, October 30-November 1, 1992). For a related document, see ED 296 483.

PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Administrator Effectiveness; Administrator Role; *Administrators; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership Training; *Principals

IDENTIFIERS *Danforth Foundation; *Danforth Preparation of School Principals Program

ABSTRACT

During the 1980s educational administration preparation programs were criticized as being irrelevant to professional administrative life. In response to this criticism, the University Council for Educational Administration reviewed preparation programs in a report entitled "Leader's for America's Schools." The review found that there was a need to define educational leadership, recruit promising candidates for educational leadership, develop collaborative relationships with school district leaders, encourage minorities and women to enter the field, and make programs more current and clinical. In 1987, the Danforth Program for the Preparation of School Principals (DPPSP) began a study of five university administration preparation programs. It found that to improve the programs there must be a readiness for change, leadership, and partnerships between key participants. Many preparation programs are reassessing their admissions standards with more emphasis on leadership potential. The academic element of preparation programs also is changing to better prepare candidates for administrative roles. Internships, field experiences, and use of cohorts were identified as important to successful preparation programs. Lessons for other preparation programs include utilizing practitioner-scholars, revising tenure criteria, reducing workloads, and providing support personnel. Additional funds, long-term university support, and shared burden are all required for a successful preparation program. (JPT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED355659

THE DANFORTH PROGRAM FOR THE PREPARATION OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS (DPPSP) SIX YEARS LATER: WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED

Mike M. Milstein
University of New Mexico

Paper Presented at

Danforth Principals Preparation Network
and
University Council for Educational Administration

October, 1992

EA 024 777

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Milstein

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE DANFORTH PROGRAM FOR THE PREPARATION OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS (DPPSP) SIX YEARS LATER: WHAT WE HAVE LEARNED

Mike M. Milstein
University of New Mexico

This paper is intended to be of help to those who are trying to make educational administration preparation programs more relevant to the role these educational leaders play. It summarizes the learnings gained since 1987 by five universities that have joined the Danforth Foundation in its efforts to stimulate new approaches to the training of educational leaders. Specifically, the paper includes a brief review of the concerns that led the Danforth Foundation to attempt to impact the preparation of educational leaders; a description of the methods of the study: a presentation of the major findings; a comparison of Danforth programs with traditional preparation programs; and, implications of what has been learned for the preparation of eduacational administrators.

The Danforth Foundation Initiative

During the 1980s the growing criticism about shortcomings in the preparation of administrators culminated in a major review of the situation by the University Council for Educational Administration, an organization that represents more than 50 leading university-based preparation programs. The report which emanated from this review, Leaders for America's Schools, (UCEA, 1987) provided much needed impetus for the change. The report

concluded that preparation programs were in need of major changes, among which include the need to:

--define effective educational leadership;

--recruit quality candidates who have the potential to become future leaders;

--develop collaborative relationships with school district leaders;

--encourage minorities and women to enter the field;

--promote continuing professional development for practicing administrators; and

--redesign preparation programs so that they are sequential, updated in content, and include meaningful clinical experiences.

In short, by the second half of the 1980's, there was a growing consensus that preparation programs needed to be reconceptualized if they were to be relevant to the job demands of educational leaders.

In 1987, at the height of this debate, the Danforth Foundation decided to use its resources to challenge universities to change the way they prepare educational leaders. This commitment has grown over the past six years. The Danforth Programs for the Preparation of School Principals (DPPSP), which began with four universities in 1987, has expanded to include 22 universities by 1992.

It is important to summarize what has been learned as a result of these experimental program efforts. They have implications for the approximately 500 higher education institutions that prepare educational administrators, many of

which are struggling to increase the relevance of their preparation programs.

Study Methods

To establish outcomes of these efforts, the Foundation initiated two studies. The first consisted of a survey that gathered basuc information about program efforts at all of the participating universities. The results of this study, which was conducted between 1990 and 1991, have been disseminated to unit heads of preparation programs throughout the country.

The second study consists of case analyses of five preparation programs that are part of the Danforth effort. Initially, all twenty-two participating programs were divided into three regions of the country. Each was visited by a regional coordinator--Bruce Barnett of Northern Colorado University in the West, Donn Gresso of East Tennessee University in the South, and David Parks of Virginia Tech in the East--to get a sense of the situation at each institution. Subsequently, the three regional coordinators met with Peter Wilson, who is responsible for the Foundation's DPPSP, and with the author of this paper, who was to do the case studies, to decide on five programs to include in the study. Criteria used for selection included 1) evidence of significant progress toward the development of an effective field-based program; 2) newer (two years) and older (four or five years) programs; 3) representation of institutions from different parts of the country; and 4) inclusion of both rural and urban universities.

Results of the initial site visits were shared and measured against the agreed-upon criteria. As a result, the University of Alabama, Central Florida University, the University of Connecticut, California State University at Fresno, and the University of Washington were selected as case study sites. After agreeing to participate each institution provided the case writer with documents to give him a basic understanding of the program. These included planning and program designs, brochures, student demographic statistics, program evaluation summaries, and papers prepared for presentation or publication.

Each of the five preparation programs was visited for approximately one week, between February and June of 1992. During the visit, interviews were held with program coordinators, faculty members, university administrators, and with a sample of students and program alumni, site supervisors, and school district leaders. Visits were made to academic class sessions and reflective seminars, and to interns' field sites. Other events were observed as possible (e.g., an orientation session for new students at Alabama, a planning meeting between the coordinator and a key superintendent at Fresno, and a dinner honoring site supervisors at Washington). Results of the visits were summarized, drafted, and shared with program coordinators and other faculty members, to be certain that facts were recorded accurately. Later, drafts were reviewed by the Foundation's regional coordinators and by Peter Wilson, as a further check on accuracy and completeness.

The detailed case studies, along with perspectives by Donn Gresso, who initiated the DPPSP, and Peter Wilson, who is the Foundation's current officer in charge of the DPPSP, will be presented in a book to be published soon. Given the large scope of the study, this paper is limited to a presentation of results that cut-across the five settings.

Results of the Study

The Dynamics of Program Change

Trying to significantly change programs for the preparation of educational leaders is a hazardous business at best. There are many pitfalls that need to be avoided and coalitions that must be developed to create sufficient momentum for such programs to survive long enough to have a fair chance of being institutionalized. The effort is doubly complicated by the fact that most traditional programs are deeply entrenched. Those who have developed and maintained these programs are not usually enthusiastic about reconceptualizing and restructuring them.

How experimental programs are established is as important as the quality of the structures and the content that are implemented. The effort to create readiness and support for the new programs at the five universities varied. However, the comon themes that emerged in these efforts are more important than the differences. The experiences of these universities highlight three important lessons regarding the dynamics of program change:

A. Readiness is a necessary foundation upon which to create new

programs. Readiness requires that there be some doubt about the appropriateness or effectiveness of current efforts. This doubt may be based upon any number of considerations; e.g., as a response to the national reform agenda, feedback from students, alumni or school district and site-based leaders, discussions about the high rate of retirement among current educational administrators, and the changing leadership requirements for our schools in the future. Whatever the specific concerns are, the important thing is to trigger the dialog and foster an interest in change. Without a sense of need, there is little likelihood that the necessary energy and willingness to take risks will be generated.

B. Program champions are necessary to guide the process. Changing the status quo requires finding individuals who are firm believers, effective organizers, and who have the commitment and energy around which others can coalesce. These individuals must have the vision to see how results can be better for program graduates, school districts, and the university, if the changes are implemented. They must also have the skills necessary to guide the effort through the thorny thickets of university and school district bureaucracies and the status to get others to join them in the effort. Such individuals must be recruited if they are not already available. If more than one champion can be identified, all the better, because different program change activities require different interests and talents. Furthermore, being a change agent can be a lonely business--having someone to work with can be quite important for the well-being of those involved and for the positive outcomes that can accrue for the program.

C. Partnerships are vital. Key influentials must be recruited to become participants and sponsors. These role players include chairpersons and deans in the university who make decisions about use of time and allocation of resources; faculty members who must modify their teaching and advisement behaviors; superintendents and other central office personnel who make decisions about district and candidate participation as well as about release time for internships and the eventual placement of graduates; and site-based administrators who must nominate program participants, arrange for classroom coverage, and act as mentors for interns. These groups play critical roles in the program. They must have a common understanding of purposes and processes for the program to succeed. For this to happen, there must be a forum for dialog in which all role players come together as equal partners to create a common vision, agree upon strategies to achieve that vision, and a firm belief that the effort will be of benefit to all parties involved. Readiness for change requires that coalitions be developed and that a basic philosophy and guiding principles for program development are open to debate so that they will be clear, comprehensive and shared.

The groundwork for change must be laid effectively before even the best conceived program is initiated. Development of sensitivity, understanding, motivation, and the willingness to take risks and remain flexible during the tentative early stages of change is dependent upon the creation of a high level of readiness for change.

Student Demographics, Admissions, Programs and Placement

The universities included in the review have made major efforts to change the ground rules regarding who participates in preparation programs. All are consciously moving away from the traditional approach, which is based on candidate self-selection, and emphasizes academic potential, but does not place much emphasis on leadership potential. All five of the universities require school district leader nominations before candidates are considered for admissions. Three expect the districts to screen applicants before submitting nominations for admissions. These are major changes from the typical walk-in, self-selected admissions candidate system that currently prevails at most universities.

The modified selection process rests on several assumptions. First, field leaders will nominate based on knowledge of candidates' potential to become educational leaders. Second, if they make these difficult nomination decisions, they are more likely to become sponsors, helping candidates obtain release time

and other resources required to complete the program successfully. Third, field leaders who nominate individuals and help them move through programs of study are more likely to be inclined to hire them or at least to help them find administrative positions than would be true if they had no such stake in candidates.

Of those admitted, the male/female ratio approximates that of most other preparation programs, with females far outnumbering males. Minority enrollments are improving, due, in large part, to purposeful recruitment. School district leaders are encouraged to seek out qualified minority candidates. Such positive recognition by established school district leaders is often sufficient impetus to cause such individuals to consider this option.

Admissions processes appear to be going through a transition, from an exclusive emphasis on academic potential to an inclusion of an emphasis on leadership potential. All five of the universities require nominations by superintendents and/or principals. Three have added essays on leadership and two include an interview that focuses on leadership and values. Although several other Danforth-related programs gather behaviorally-anchored information, such as that which is provided by assessment centers, none of the five case study settings have done so.

As depicted in Figure 1, the pool of candidates is relatively high, varying from 2 to 5 times the numbers accepted

for admissions, with the exception of Fresno, which currently takes all qualified applicants nominated by district superintendents. On the output end, results are less clear, with three institutions' graduates doing quite well in finding positions and two institutions' graduates not being very successful in this effort. In both situations there are extenuating circumstances--the University of Connecticut has only a few graduates at this point, and the University of Central Florida's graduates have encountered a severe budgetary problem that is causing school districts to reduce their administrative overhead rather than consider hiring new administrators.

Finally, depending upon state licensure requirements, the type of programs offered vary. In California, Florida and Washington, a masters degree can be earned while obtaining administrative certification. In Alabama, teachers are expected to have obtained a masters degree in their area of preparation, while in Connecticut most teachers come to the program with a masters and work to obtain a 6th year diploma as well as administrative certification. Such variations are to be expected, given the fact that the each state sets its own rules for professional licensure.

Students: Critical Elements

The efforts made to control who participates in preparation programs are changing the composition of student groups. Important shifts in emphasis include the following:

A. Purposeful selection increases the likelihood of identifying

candidates with high potential, both academically and as future leaders in education. Educational leadership has much to learn from other professionals, such as medicine and law, both of which understand the importance of controlling entrance to their fields. Besides promoting a better selection process, it promotes identification of more minority candidates and encourages shared responsibility as school district leaders, site administrators, and university faculty members cooperate to manage the nomination process.

B. Admissions processes are in need of review and change. Traditionally, the emphasis has been on academic potential (e.g., nationally-normed tests, transcripts to ascertain grade point averages, and recommendations that tend to focus on the likelihood of completing a program of studies). These criteria are useful to establish the candidates' potential as students, but they are not particularly helpful in establishing their potential as leaders. The ability to absorb and recall knowledge is important, but the more important intent of preparation is to produce leaders, not scholars. Leaders are measured by their sense of purpose, ability to get others engaged with them as they translate purposes, manage the enterprise, and intervene when required to keep the system on target. These are qualities that are best measured by past leadership behaviors, the existence of an educational platform that can be exhibited through clear communication of purposes, and demonstration of the ability to respond adequately in situations that require leadership behaviors.

C. Responsibility for placement has traditionally been left to individual graduates. There has been little effort to guide the process on the part of those preparing these candidates. Closer working relationships among school district leaders, site administrators and university faculty members are beginning to change this situation. A sponsorship system is beginning to evolve and, with it, a much better placement record for program graduates is beginning to emerge. Nomination and selection to participate in preparation programs is the first step toward controlling entrance to the profession. Effective preparation is the second step. Purposeful involvement in the placement process is the third step.

Academic Offerings

Effective preparation programs require academic programs that can meet the emerging needs of educational leaders who are being asked to be facilitators, instructional leaders,

and team managers. Recognizing this, some universities are working at redefining academic content and how it is delivered in their preparation programs, but in most cases, not to the extent that they are improving the quality of internships. This is not surprising, given that academic programs were already in place at these institutions, while the internship component had to be created or drastically changed. The complexity of the task and the limited time available may encourage planners to focus on relative vacuums first, but changes and improvements in the field component of programs must be matched by changes and improvements in academic content and delivery.

Academic Offerings: Critical Elements

Each of the five universities has made efforts to change and improve the academic content of its preparation program. Variations across programs reflect differences in environmental situations, program longevity, the extent to which efforts to change have been balanced between internship enrichment and academic content change, and purposeful evaluation. The outcomes of their efforts have implications for other preparation programs:

A. The academic content of preparation programs must emphasize the skills and knowledge that are required in the roles for which students are preparing. This can only happen if faculty members are willing to examine current programs, eliminate content that is not directly relevant, and reduce time given to content which can be appropriately modified. Faculty must also create new content after they become knowledgeable about the roles and activities that novice administrators are likely to encounter when they complete preparation programs.

B. The delivery of academic content must change in ways that

increases the potential for learning. They must also role model better ways of delivering instruction in schools. Included in this effort is the need to break out of the set course mentality (i.e., 3 credits for 45 semester hours equals a course); exploring alternatives such as units and modules; capitalizing on what is known about adult learning by promoting interactive learning and reducing the emphasis on didactic/lecturing approaches; tapping the wealth of instructional talent that is available in other units of the university and among educational administrators in the field; experimenting with different time blocks--from less than an hour to several days or more--and times of the day for delivery of instruction to maximize upon readiness to learn; and exploring alternative locations for instruction that are more accessible and that capitalize on the learnings that can be obtained at these sites.

C. Evaluation, both formative and summative, needs to be conducted, to encourage incremental improvements of academic content and delivery of instruction. Changes which will be required to respond to the demands for reform call for ongoing evaluations of efforts.

No longer can preparation programs be viewed in a static way. Rather, it is more appropriate to think of them as living organisms. The need for change will be constant, if preparation programs are expected to survive and thrive. Serious review and revamping of preparation content and instructional delivery is long past due. Sacred cows must be challenged, particularly given the rapid rate of societal change and the demand for comparable change in our school systems. Those charged with preparation of tomorow's educational leaders must be willing to be critical of their current efforts and ready to make the changes that are needed.

Internships

The establishment of a more structured set of field experiences for future educational administrators is centrally important to the entire program redesign effort. In particular,

efforts need to be made to increase the quality of the experience and the time-on-task for the clinical component of the program.

Each of the five universities has developed a handbook or manual to guide the internship experience. However, as the brief descriptions of the internship structure at the five universities which are depicted in Figure 2 indicate, there is no simple formula, particularly given the different contingenicies that exist at each location.

Besides overall facilitation by the coordinator, direct internship supervision is conducted by two role players--site managers (usually principals) who are encouraged to act as mentors, and field supervisors who provide guidance and support and monitor the mentor/intern relationship. The interns' experiences are greatly affected by the quality of supervision provided by these two individuals.

In all five cases, field supervisors are university professors. There is a logic to their being involved in the program: It helps them become sensitive to the needs of students and encourages them to gear their teaching and program advisement to meet these needs. However, many of them have never been school administrators. Even those who have, have typically not been in school leadership positions for some time. It is questionable that, as a group, they can be as effective in this role as school-based administrators with extensive experience and positive reputations as leaders. Further, field supervision, whether it includes load credit or not, inevitably cuts into the

time faculty need to devote to teaching and research.

Relations with mentors are identified with regularity by program participants as the most important element in their development as educational leaders. All five institutions refer to site supervisors as mentors and each is trying to insure that the role is more extensive than that which is typically expected of site supervisors. Beyond supervision, mentors, as the more experienced partners in the arrangement, are encouraged to develop close, caring, and ongoing relationships with interns.

When the relationship develops as intended, mentors provide leadership opportunities, give feedback for growth, offer a sympathetic ear for the inevitable questions and concerns that arise, and act as role models to be emulated. However, for the relationship to be effective three things must exist. First, a system which includes mentor nominations by highly-reputable field-based leaders and review and selection by university faculty members who know the field, has to be established. Second, because mentoring is a unique activity, training must be provided to clarify role expectations and provision of ongoing support and feedback as the relationship develops. Third, an evaluation system must be established to ascertain whether mentors are providing the support that interns require. Mentors who are not may need corrective feedback or may even have to be removed from the mentor pool.

Extrinsic rewards for mentors are minimal, although there are some efforts to provide rewards such as library privileges

and invitations to join students and alumni at various kinds of learning sessions. However, mentors do receive important intrinsic rewards. They get the opportunity to reflect on their leadership behaviors and decisions as they explain what they do to interns. They also get the opportunity to catch up on the latest thinking about educational administration as they listen to interns talk about their reading and classroom experiences. Most important, they get the chance to directly influence the next generation of educational leaders. This is a special privilege and a rewarding activity for many mid-career administrators.

In short, it should be recognized that mentoring provides unique professional development opportunities for site-based leaders. In fact, when the mentoring relationship works well, it appears to be as important to the mentor as it is to the intern. These positive outcomes have not typically been given much consideration in field-based preparation programs.

Internships: Critical Elements

Reorienting preparation programs toward more emphasis on field-based experiences has been a major challenge for these universities. There are four areas in particular that have direct implications for other universities seeking to move in this direction:

A. Effective Internship experiences require sufficient time-on-task in challenging situations. Thus far it has been extremely difficult to secure the time needed during the school year, when students are in attendance, for program participants to get the field experiences they need to learn the leadership roles for

which they are preparing. Resources must be obtained in order to provide adequate release time for this activity. Without sufficient time on task interns cannot shift their thinking from teacher to administrator, gain a clear perception of the role requirements of site-based leadership, or gain the skills and knowledge to function effectively in administrative roles.

B. Multiple field experiences should be encouraged. This diversity permits interns to observe different leadership styles, gain clearer understandings of aspects of leadership that are unique to different school levels and those that are universally important. Cross-district internships can further broaden interns' perspectives.

C. Mentor and field supervisor roles should be made clear. Mentoring, as noted, is an activity that goes beyond normal site supervision. It is an important role and should be clarified. Similarly, the field supervisor's role must be understood and agreed upon by all parties. Beyond role definition, to make this role function as effectively as possible sufficient site visits must be made to provide guidance for the formation of goals and plans, activities conducted in pursuit of these plans, and meaningful evaluations of results. Adequate training must be provided for mentors and field supervisors if these roles are to be conducted effectively.

D. Opportunities for reflection time are vital for interns to learn from their experiences in the field. Personal reflection needs to be cultivated. In addition, the more students can explore meaning through reflection with peers and others, the more sense-making is likely to occur. Experiences are accumulated with great rapidity at the field-based sites, so opportunities to share reflections should be provided with regularity. Weekly or at least bi-weekly reflection sessions are required for this to happen.

Cohorts

Traditional programs admit students several times a year and offer courses in a cafeteria style fashion, which makes it almost impossible to promote and maintain cohorts. Even when such programs are presented in some sort of sequence, there is no way to insure that cohorts will develop, given differences in pacing with which students move through them.

All Danforth-related programs admit students to their

experimental programs at established times, typically for summer or fall matriculation. The deliberate attempt to create cohorts has turned out to be one of the more important elements of the preparation process.

Each of the five universities goes about promoting cohorts in its own way. Alabama presents all academic work, exclusively for program members, in an intensive 10-week session during the first summer of the program. Plans to establish a "bridging" class will bring the cohort onto campus for a full week duirng both the fall and spring semesters. At Central Florida, one or two courses per semester are reserved exclusively for program members, to promote group development. Extra-curricular activities bring members together to share a variety of unique experiences. Connecticut limits most of its courses to cohort members and also brings the group together once a month for a reflective seminar. Fresno's courses are limited to program members who also participate in frequent day-long workshops on current topics in administration. Washington has an intensive residential session aimed at group and team development during the first summer of the program, courses limited to program members, weekly reflection seminars, and an intensive week of synthesizing activities during the culminating summer.

Lessons for other institutions include the following:

A. <u>At the program management level</u>, cohort development is important. It permits the coordinator to plan for student recruitment and selection, and later for placement as interns, in a <u>cyclical</u> and therefore <u>more efficient manner</u>. It also facilitates the <u>purposeful sequencing of courses</u>.

B. At the human learning and growth level, cohort development promotes support systems and networking among members of the student group. In fact, the cohort concept is becoming one of the mainstays of these programs as the recognition grows that there is strength in numbers, particularly for participants in complex, innovative, and demanding programs.

C. Cohorts encourage long-term support systems as graduates help each other identify and seek administrative positions and provide a sympathetic ear and a source of suggestions for leadership behavior in difficult situations once positions are obtained. Many close lifetime friendships are also forged as a result of these intensive interactions.

D. The cohort approach provides a model of how schools can be transformed into adult learning communities. Cohort members who share in this powerful experience recognize how the learning approach can be transferred to the school site. They have experienced empowerment as adult learners and are more aware of the need to practice collaborative leadership as school administrators.

Program Management and Coordination

In the past few years these five universities have focused on improving their preparation programs, particularly the field experience portion. Formerly these preparation programs were organized in supermarket fashion. Like food shoppers, potential students, seeing little differences between preparation programs, chose one over another because of geographical convenience. Courses were developed and put on the shelf in hopes of attracting consumers who filtered through the program aisles at different rates of speed and with different degrees of enthusiasm about purchasing items on the shelf. Relatively speaking, only a few consumers bothered to engage in hands-on field experiences.

The new programs include such complex oversight activities as 1) active recruitment, 2) admission of students in cohorts, 3) development of academic experiences that are grounded in reality

and presented in an interactive style which is coherent and sequential, and 4) promotion of enriched internship experiences for students. These activities require much more management and coordination. Where part-time attention to these responsibilities sufficed in the past, the expansion of activities has required significant program supervision and coordination.

All five of the universities have struggled with this issue as they deal with rapid rates of program growth and with the increasing complexity of program designs. Each, in its own way, has had to cope with issues such as:

--what kind of leadership is needed to assure effective coordination?

--How can program continuity be established when there is leadership turnover?

--How can a meaningful reward system be created for those who take on this role?

--How can adequate clerical support be provided at a time when there are few, if any, new resources?

Four lessons for other institutions are worth noting:

A. Practitioner-scholars are needed to fill program coordinating roles. These individuals must have legitimacy with field leaders and understand the learning needs of interns at school sites. They must also be sensitive to academic program needs and be able to make contributions to that program. These unique attributes are not widely available. They are most likely to be found among successful educational administrators who also have shown an interest in continuing professional development, conducting research, and writing for publication. These rare individuals are most likely to be able to bridge the large gaps that frequently exist between universities and school districts.

B. Tenure criteria do not usually give serious consideration to service activities such as coordination of field-based programs.

They must be reviewed and modified appropriately to reward rather than punish those who take on this role. The activity is of value to the university, and those who manage it should be given appropriate credit for their efforts. This is not a recommendation to excuse coordinators who are on tenure tracks from doing research and publishing. However, the balance of research and publishing with service must be reconsidered for these role players. It may be more appropriate to define the coordinator's role as a clinical professorship, which could be either a tenure track line, if coordination activities leave time for research and publication, or a non-tenure track line if coordination is intended to be a full time activity.

C. Adequate load reduction needs to be provided for this complex and demanding coordinating activity. Working with the many partners involved, guiding students through the many challenges they confront, and overseeing the processing of paper work that goes with the effort, are major time consuming responsibilities. They are responsiblities that require appropriate load reduction if they are going to be accomplished effectively.

D. Sufficient support personnel need to be secured to process clerical activities (e.g., recruitment literature, admissions procedures and student files, internship placement information, communications, and evaluations) that keep the program afloat. In cases where no new resources are accessible, there must at least be reasonable efforts to re-distribute existing support personnel time and availability. Field-based programs require constant attention and sufficient support personnel who process tasks and report to the coordinator.

Resources

Field-based preparation programs in educational administration require substantially more resources than do traditional preparation programs. Field-based programs demand richer funding because:

--Extensive coordination is necessary for the various phases of the program--recruitment, selection, admissions, program management, internship placement, supervision, evaluation, and assistance in obtaining initial placement. Depending on the size and complexity of the program, these activities require the full-or part-time attention of one or more faculty members.

--Support personnel and space must be provided to enable coordinators to function effectively.

--Release time must be made available so students can be excused from their regular duties to have concentrated periods of time for hands-on experiences working with site-based mentors.

--Support needs to be made available to engage leading educational administrators as instructors to improve the academic curriculum and its delivery because effective academic programs require a balance between theory and practice.

--Enrichment activities such as guest speakers, retreats, and attendance at professional conferences are important but costly learning elements, especially during the formative stages of leadership preparation.

Administrators of traditional programs rely on the generation of student tuitions to obtain necessary resources. Their goal is to show a bottom line of sufficient student credit hours to justify continued university support for the program and its faculty. Administrators of field-based programs must be much more aggressive about securing additional university funding as well as resources from other key partners, such as students and school districts.

All five of the universities have taken full advantage of Danforth Foundation support to help initiate their programs. These funds have been useful in many ways, including bringing people together to plan programs and enabling faculty members from different Danforth-supported programs to get together to share concerns and ideas. This relatively small resource base has the distinct advantage of being free of institutional constraints that typically accompany university funding. For

example, many universities place severe restrictions on the use of institutional funds for meetings that involve food or entertainment.

Each of the five universities is attempting to institutionalize its experimental program, but this requires an adequate and secure resource base. Without this base, programs are in jeopardy of termination or, just as bad, continuing, but only in form, not in substance. It is unrealistic to believe that field-based preparation programs can be created, established and institutionalized without an adequate resource base. The movement from a self-contained, campus-based program for leadership preparation, to one that is field-based and involves extensive coordination, can only come about if adequate resources are committed to the effort.

Three implications for other preparation programs stand out:

A. Risk capital must be obtained, particularly at the initial stages of program planning and design. This is when partnerships need to be developed and dialogs need to be established and maintained. This early and tenuous period of time requires a small but important resource base to bring people together to create program purposes and designs. A variety of sources have to be tapped for funds, including grants by foundations, business partnerships, and university-generated funds.

B. Long-term university support must be committed. Program changes of this magnitude require institutional allocation of resources for purposes such as release time, coordination, support staff for the coordinator, space to house staff and records, and pay for adjunct instructors.

C. All partners who benefit should be expected to share the resource burden. These programs, if well executed, benefit all role players, who should therefore be expected to provide necessary resources. They benefit students because they obtain the insights, skills, and exposure needed to become educational leaders. They benefit school districts that can identify

potential leaders and then observe program participants in action before deciding whether to hire them. They also get opportunities to participate in the shaping of the leadership behaviors and styles of the coming generation of administrators. They benefit state-level policy making centers because they are demanding more appropriate and effective preparation of educational leaders. They benefit universities and colleges of education because they establish more positive institutional images in the educational community, promote opportunities for additional partnerships, and increasing opportunities for faculty members to conduct research. As beneficiaries of these programs, it is reasonable to argue that each of these role players should contribute resources to support the programs.

Institutionalization

At some point, field-based programs must be institutionalized. Otherwise they will quickly become history. Too often we develop interesting and important programatic innovations, only to find that they do not persist because of:

--lack of resources,

--frustration or exhaustion on the part of program champions,

--program personnel moving on to other projects or other places,

--turn-over among the key actors who provided initial protection and support, or

--intense rear-guard actions initiated by those opposed to the new approach.

Several factors are associated with successful efforts to move from identification of a set of needs and beliefs, to alternative ideas, pilot testing, implementation and program modifications, and, finally, to institutionalization. These factors include:

--a genuine and publicly-agreed-upon concern about the efficacy of the existing preparation program on

the part of the faculty, and a willingness to examine alternative approaches,

--a clear vision, meaningful purposes, and a basic agreement about the program design,

--highly committed program coordinators who are capable and have positive reputations in school districts,

--understanding and support from key players, such as college deans, school superintendents and principals,

--risk capital for such needs as the development of networks, recruitment of excellent candidates, support for planning and program change as needed, and for implementation of alternative instructional delivery systems, and, perhaps most important,

--the courage to stay the course through the inevitable difficult times that will occur and the insight to make changes that improve the program and its impact on leadership preparation.

In the process of institutionalizing an innovative program caution must be raised about not compromising key program elements. For example, complying with university expectations for "packaging" academic experiences as specific and long-established student credit hour formulations can decrease the ability of the program to be responsive to students' learning needs. Similarly, responding to budgetary constraints by reducing requirements for the amount of time interns are expected to be in the field can negatively impact students' growth and development as educational leaders.

Further, if institutionalization means elimiinating the status quo program, which it did in the present cases, other issues may arise:

--The sponsorship and candidate selection system may be compromised as all individuals seeking preparation are processed through what were initially experimental program structures;

--It may be difficult to promote and maintain cohorts if admissions is permitted at multiple points in the year and/or students can self-select into courses at their own pace.

--Field-based programs attract candidates who typically are more highly motivated than other preparation program candidates. Admitting all candidates into the same program may lead to friction between these groups and pressures to reduce the intensity of the program.

--Many students enter traditional preparation programs out of curiosity. Some drop by the wayside, while others continue on to become administrators. Requiring candidates to have the commitment at the outset that is expected of field-based cohorts may, unfortunately, eliminate some "shoppers" who could become excellent candidates for leadership positions in education.

--Today's new thinking may become tomorrow's conservative and rigid status quo. Given the rapidly changing environment in which educational leaders function, care must be taken to build in an ongoing interest and capacity for change. Improvement of leadership preparation programs is an on-going task.

Such problems can be dealt with, but only if careful consideration is given to the costs and benefits of making an innovative program design the only choice for preparation candidates.

Institutionalization is, in short, a double-edged sword. It is critically important to insure the continuation of important and proven innovations, but if the process is not closely monitored and guided, it can also compromise the intent,

structure, and content of the program.

Each of the five universities has given consideration to the question of institutionalization. In fact, at four of them--Central Florida is not yet at this stage--the decision has been made to eliminate the prior program and move to a field-based program as the only preparation option. These important decisions were made at Connecticut after only two years, Fresno after three years, Washington after four years, and Alabama after five years. Each became effective as of the summer or fall of 1992. This seems to point to an important reality: before consideration of institutionalization can be taken seriously, at least several years of experimentation and modification with the program are necessary.

A Comparison of Traditional and Danforth-Related Field-Based Programs

Six years have passed since the Danforth Foundation initiated its efforts to have a positive impact on the preparation of educational administrators. This is a relatively short period of time, particularly when measured against the time behavioral science-based programs, which currently dominate preparation have had to evolve since the 1950s. However, even at this early point in the development of Danforth-type field-based programs, sufficient experience and knowledge exist to identify trends and to make relevant comparisons between the two types of programs.

These comparisons, as identified in Figure 3, leave one with

the unmistakable conclusion that there are distinct and important differences between the two types of programs. In most instances, field-based programs are more likely to strive to be:

A. Selective concerning who is permitted to participate in them. Efforts are made to carefully choose students on the basis of leadership potential and the process involves field leaders as well as university faculty members.

B. Designed to emphasize leadership development. Hands-on, proactive learning is more likely to dominate in the classroom and at internship sites. Students are challenged to test their capacity as leaders and take risks to grow as necessary before taking on administrative roles.

C. Based on adult learning principles. Programs are being reshaped and sequenced in ways that promote adult learning and development. Instruction is delivered in interactive and highly participative ways.

D. Experiential. Courses tend to emphasize case studies, role playing, simulations and analyses of field experiences. Internships, which are goal driven, often include the development of contracts between interns and their supervisors, and emphasize direct administrative responsibility more than shadowing and observing.

E. Complex. Field-based programs are typically more complicated at all stages, from recruitment and selection to assistance with placement. As such, they require more planning and coordination.

F. Supported in many ways by a wide network of role players as partners in the effort. Field-based programs, by their very nature, require the participation and involvement of school district leaders, site-based administrators, and program alumni, as well as faculty members, adjunct instructors, and current students. All of these partners can be called on to provide assistance and support for activities such as recruitment and selection, program design and delivery, and placement of graduates. If the program is to succeed, partnerships that emphasize advocacy and support are required.

Implications for the Future of Administrator Preparation

We are in a time of major ferment. The field-based

preparation programs discussed in the paper may be presagers of the way educational leadership preparation will be conducted in the future. The 1990's will probably be remembered as the time when a major break was made with the preparation programs of the past, just as the behavioral science/theory movement radically altered educational administration preparation since the 1960's.

Enthusiasm Prevails

There is great excitement brewing at the universities included in the study. Site visits were not purposefully planned around specific program events, yet regardless of when the visits were made, there was a positive energy perrmeating the setting. Faculty members and field leaders were engaged in planning, sharing instructional ideas, and making changes to improve programs. This was the situation whether the program was in its second year or its fifth year.

Students were deeply engrossed and energized with academic and field projects. They were involved with their peers, sharing with each other their enthusiasm, perplexities, anxieties, and frustrations. When asked to describe their programs metaphorically, with little prodding, students were able to capture the essence of their experience. Here are a few examples:

--It's like a jazz piece. It has central themes with room for improvisation and it writes itself as it is being played.

--It's transformational, like a metamorphosis, opening doors on perspectives and possibilities.

--It's like vitamins. It enriches your life!

--It's like being buried in the Encyclopedia Brittanica.

--It's like a wide angle lens with a growing aperture.

--It's like being a spider building a web. The supports are the university, my colleagues, my mentor and my principal.

--It's like being a flower waiting to bloom.

--It's like being a kindergarten student on her first field trip (without mom!).

--It's like being on a roller coaster ride.

These positive metaphors reflect a sense of enthusiasm, challenge, growth, and opportunity, responses which are not typically heard from students in more traditional preparation programs. They are the remarks of students who see value in what they are experiencing and the solid foundation it is giving them as they prepare to take on educational leadership roles.

Their sense of self and belief in their ability to meet the challenges ahead of them as educational leaders is extremely positive. They see themselves as special. After all, they have sponsorship and they have been selected for highly competitive programs that are challenging.

Evidence has not been collected that can prove whether these students are actually "better" than others. In fact, it may just be the Pygmalion effect; i.e., they believe in their worth because of the different way they are treated, from initial selection through placement. <u>The important thing is that they do, indeed, feel special and capable, qualities that are</u>

critically important as a foundation for the development of effective leadership.

Independent Inventions of Universal Truths

Each of the five field-based programs is unique, being created, designed, modified and maintained to meet the specific contingencies that exist in its particular environment. Yet, while differences may appear large when viewed from afar, they are discernable as variations on a commmon theme when viewed up close. In fact, concerns and modification efforts at each site are clearly aimed at establishing the same kinds of improvements. In short, similarities are more pervasive than differences. Briefly stated, across sites:

--The mission is to identify individuals with potential as educational leaders and to provide them with preparation experiences that enhance this potential.

--There is recognition that current preparation programs must be changed significantly for this to happen.

--This requires breaking free of the constraining mind-set that curriculum should be exclusively determined by university faculty members, instruction should be delivered in narrowly-defined time periods at university centers and mainly by faculty members.

--The field component of the program is critically important to the learning process. As such, it should be structured in ways that insure high quality experiences and sufficient time-on-task.

Professionalization of Educational Administration

Medicine and law recognize the need to guide novices who aspire to become doctors and lawyers, through a series of increasingly complex and meaningful experiences that prepare them

to join the ranks of professionals in their field. They also recognize that this process is intensive, lengthy, and requires substantial investment of resources on the part of all partners, and that many aspirants are not likely to make it through the process.

Efforts being made by faculty members, students, and educational leaders to develop field-based programs are shifting preparation toward the doctor/lawyer model. Inevitably, this will lead to increased professionalization of educational admiinistration.

The educational leadership community is joining together to identify promising leaders for the future, to provide meaningful preparation programs that emphasize learning by doing, and to discriminate among candidates in the identification of who will move into leadership roles.

Life Long Learning

These field-based programs are as much about serving adult learners who recognize the need to pursue life long learning as they are about certification or licensure for educational administrators. Alumni are pressing coordinators to consider their need for continuing involvement in the learning process. For example, they are asking to be considered as site supervisors and to be allowed to attend various program-sponsored events. They are also reporting a need for continuing learning opportunities as they make the transition into leadership positions. Some universities are responding by cooperating with

school districts to develop a variety of induction experiences for program graduates. Finally, as another indicator of their interest in life long learning, many graduates are making application for advanced study at the doctoral level.

The same enthusiasm for life long learning is being reported by mentors. They recognize the wonderful opportunities for professional development: the chance to reflect on their leadership behavior patterns, to share the learning that their interns are experiencing, and the chance to meet and dialog with colleagues and university faculty members. The life long learning needs of these senior administrators are being well-served by the process.

The point is that "preparation" can no longer be viewed as something that is engaged in exlusively before obtaining a leadership position. The human drive to grow and learn and the rapidly changing environment in which leaders perform their roles require a long-term perspective on preparation. This reality will challenge current approaches of universities that engage in educational leadership preparation.

In Conclusion

There is no way of insuring that fledgling programs will survive to move from ideas to innovations and on to intitutionalization. In fact, it is just as likely that they will not, given problems such as inadequate resources for release time, coordination and support needs; faculty disinterest in

changing programs; and little history of meaningful partnerships between field leaders and university personnel. Even with the added status and extra funding they received, some of the universities that joined the Danforth Foundation program have seen their experimental programs fall by the wayside.

To make the process work, all interested parties must be convinced that the program will lead to a win-win situation:

--Students need to see their preparation programs as meaningful and relevant;

--Faculty need to recognize that they can do a better job of preparing students and that they will have greater access to field sites, which will increase their knowledge base for teaching, research, and writing; and

--School districts need to understand that they will have a larger and more direct role in identifying and sharing in the preparation of the next generation of leaders.

With this combination of potential pay-offs, and a willingness to stay the course for perhaps five years or more, the potential for creating and maintaining meaningful field-based programs is greatly increased.

Reference

University Council for Educational Administration. (1987). Leaders for America's schools: The report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. Tempe, AZ: Author.

Figure 1

Program Participants

	Recruitment	Approximate Selection Ratio	Cohort Demographics Male	Female	Majority	Minority	Admissions Process	Type of Program	Placement
Alabama	Superintendent and Principal nominations	1 of 5 applicants	22%	78%	75%	25%	Traditional plus essay on educational leadership	Non-Degree (Certification only)	5 yrs = 70% estimate
Central Florida	Principals nominate District screening committee	1 of 5 applicants	15%	85%	72%	28%	Traditional	Masters	1 year = 11%
Connecticut	Principals nominate Districts encouraged to screen nominees	1 of 3 applicants	32%	68%	79%	21%	Traditional plus; 1) recommendations from a peer teacher and a district administrator, and 2) an interview with a committee of field administrators & university faculty members to establish motivation & leadership potential	Non-Degree Certification +6th Year Diploma Program)	1 year = 1 of 4(25%)
Fresno	Superintendents nominate	All who qualify	32%	68%	67%	33%	Traditional	Masters or Certification	1 year = 67%
Washington	Most nominated by principals & screened by district committees; a few self-identified	1 of 2 applicants	37%	63%	71%	29%	Traditional plus 1) recommendations from principal, a teacher the principal chooses, and one the candidates selects; 2) an interview with field leaders and university faculty to clarify values about leadership; and 3) an essay on leadership under changing conditions	Masters or Certification	4 years = 72%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Figure 2

Internship Information

	Where	Time	When	Guidelines Activities	Supervision	Opportunities for Reflection
Alabama	At Candidate's School	300-500 hours	1 Week before and 1 week after school term; Rest by arrangement with mentor	Detailed manual to guide internship activities and evaluation	University faculty as field supervisors, who visit sites a few times; Mentors are principals from intern schools	Presently 4 Saturdays a year; Adding a "Bridging Class" 1 week in fall and spring
Central Florida	In own district but not own school; 2 experiences at different levels; 1 must be at a site at least 20% different in demographics from own school	Was 35 days, now 24 days	Was 15 days during school term and 20 in summer; Now 12 days in each of 2 summers	General manual with state competencies to guide activities and evaluation	University faculty as field supervisors; Mentors nominated by school district and selected by coordinator	Only during regular classes or when coordinator calls group together (e.g., 1/2 hour before class or on a Saturday at her home)
Connecticut	Outside own district; 1 experience, unless mentor arranges for alternative summer experiences	90 days	15 days in Fall, 15 days in Spring, 30 days in each of 2 summers	Handbook with general role expectations and evaluation guidelines; Interns set own goals	University faculty as field supervisors who visit sites 4 times; Mentors nominated by school districts and selected from a mentor pool by the coordinator	Once per month
Fresno	Assigned by superintendent	Is 1500 hours, will be 150 hours	Is during school year; Will be during the summer	Guidbook with desired competencies and how to evaluate them	University faculty as field supervisors, who visit sites 2 times per semester; Mentors selected by superintendents	Only in required classes
Washington	3 experiences, 2 must be outside district; Students find sites from established mentor pool	Minimum of 1/2 time for a year or 700 hours, Some get full time, or 1400 hours	During school year	Handbook defining mentor/intern roles, activities and evaluation	University faculty member as field supervisors; Mentors nominated by school district and selected from a mentor pool by the coordinator	Weekly

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Figure 3

Traditional and Danforth Field-Based Programs

Categories	Traditional	Field Based
Participant Sponsorship	None, other than recommendation forms	Usually by district committee, superintendent and/or principal
Recruitment	None usually	By districts and university
Admissions	Review of file which emphasizes academic potential and is typically limited to transcripts, recommendations, standard exams	File with academic potential evidence is supplemented by evidence of leadership potential (educational platform, essay on leadership, interviews, assessment centers)
Advisement	Relatively little at M.A. or Ed.S. level, and limited to university faculty members	Extensive by coordinator as well as by field and site supervisors
Coordination	Minimal--usually limited to course scheduling by chairperson	Extensive--includes all stages of the effort, recruitment to placement
Student progression through program	At individual pace and typically over 3 or 4 years	At a predetermined pace and typically over 15 months to two years
Student grouping	None except by chance	In cohorts and usually extends beyond classes to include reflective seminars and other settings
Student evaluation	Course grades and sometimes an oral or written exam at end of the program	Course grades, but also regular feedback by coordinator as well as field and site supervisors, student reflection, and end-of-program exams
Program evaluation	Usually when an external review occurs, to comply with requests for information, and done by faculty members	Regularly and involves students, alumni, field administrators, as members as well as faculty members

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Placement	Minimal involvement by faculty, beyond maintaining job-related information	Active advisement and networking by coordinator with program graduates and hiring school districts
Resources	Provided by students (tuition) and university (salaries and overhead support)	Provided by students (tuition, materials and supplies), university (salaries, overhead support, space, coordinator load reduction), school districts (release time funds)
Partnerships	University dominated if done at all, infrequent meetings	Broad based, toward equal roles in decisionmaking, frequent meetings
Program design and development	By faculty and not typically reviewed often	Done collaboratively and modified on basis of feedback
Academic program	Emphasis on theory and content, deductive approach	Balance between theory and practice, inductive approach
Instruction	Didactic, with professor as knowledge giver and student playing a passive role; professors do most of instructing, usually as individuals	Adult learning oriented with student playing a proactive role; practitioners as well as professors as instructors, often in teams
Field experiences/ internships	Not usually required, vary widely in quality and time on task	Integral part of program, effort to insure high quality and sufficient time on task
Field supervision	Often haphazard and infrequent, responsibility without load reduction and done by junior or adjunct faculty	Planned visits done frequently, usually with load reduction and involving senior faculty members
Site supervision	Usually by chance or circumstances, with little or no preparation for the role	Carefully selected supervisors who are given training and encouraged to act as mentors

BEST COPY AVAILABLE